

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

MONTALETO C. McKISSICK,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. CIV-07-1315-M
	)	
CHRIS HENDERSHOT, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	


**ORDER**

The Plaintiff has asked for a 30-day extension of time to respond to the Defendants' interrogatories. The Defendants object to an extension on Interrogatory Numbers 1 through 11, but do not object to an extension of time on Interrogatory Numbers 12 and 13. The objection is overruled.

The issue under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A) is whether good cause exists for the additional time. The Plaintiff states that he needs to use the law library, and the Defendants state that the Plaintiff does not need to conduct legal research to provide the answers to questions 1 through 11. But the Plaintiff is entitled to conduct legal research to determine the scope of his duties as the responding party and the availability of objections. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(4). There is no trial date, and the additional time would not prejudice the Defendants. Accordingly, the Court overrules the objection and grants the Plaintiff's request

for a 30-day extension of time to respond to all of the interrogatories. The Plaintiff's new response deadline is June 19, 2008.<sup>1</sup>

So ordered this 14th day of May, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert E. Bacharach  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> In the motion for an extension of time, the Plaintiff inadvertently stated that he wanted to extend the deadline from May 20, 2008, to May 19, 2008. He presumably meant to request an extension of time until June 19, 2008.